Application No. 10/634,585 Amendment Dated February 17, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2005

total and

ART BOWN TURE

#### "REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Office Action dated February 3, 2004. In that it action the Examiner entered a restriction requirement as to Group, I (claims, 1-9, and, 29), and not action the Examiner entered as restriction requirement as to Group, I (claims, 2-28 and 30-41).

With this Office Action Response, Applicants withdraw claims 27-28 and 30-41 (in response to the restriction requirement), and amend claims 3, 5-10 and 30-31.

#### I. RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the group designated by the Examiner as Group I (claims 1-9 and 29). Although not specifically designated as Group I claims, the Office action further indicates that if Group I is elected, claims 10-26 will be examined with the Group I claims. This election is without traverse as to claims 27, 28 and 32-41; however, Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction with respect to claims 30 and 31. The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures (MPEP) states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

(MPEP, Section 803). Applicants respectfully submit that there will be no additional burden on the Examiner to examine claims 30 and 31. For example, claim 3 (in Group I) requires:

The method as defined in claim 2 wherein the selectively tuning step further comprises controlling an amount of capacitance coupled to the transmitting antenna.

Similarly, Group II claim 30, which depends directly from claim 29 (of Group I), specifically requires:

The method as defined in claim 29 wherein the tuning the second antenna step further comprises controlling an amount of capacitance coupled to the second antenna.

Thus, the Examiner, in examining Group I, must search for art that teaches "controlling an amount of capacitance." This search, by its very nature, overlaps with the search that may be required with respect to claim 30 of Group II.

Likewise, claim 6 (in Group I) requires:

The method as defined in claim 2 wherein the selectively tuning step further comprises controlling inductance of the winding antenna.

CEST AMELE COPY

4, 5

10 41

A. G. LURE

· 12年, 4部次

Application No. 10/634,585 Amendment Dated February 17, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 3, 2005

Similarly, Group II claim 31, which depends directly from claim 29 (of Group I), specifically and a requires:

The method as defined in claim 29 wherein the tuning the second antenna step: we make the second transmitting antenna.

Thus, the Examiner, in examining Group I, must search for art that teaches controlling inductance of an antenna. This search, by its very nature, overlaps with the search that may be required with respect to claim 31 of Group II.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30 and 31 should be examined along with the Group I claims, and thus the restriction requirement as to these claims withdrawn.

### II. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

With this Response, Applicants amend claim 10 to remove the "adapted" terminology. Further, Applicants amend claims 3, 5-9 and 30-31 to remove the "step" terminology, to ensure that these claims are not interpreted as step-plus-function claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 6. These amendments are not made to define over any prior art, and are not a narrowing amendment.

#### III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite the resolution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Conley Rose, P.C. Deposit Account. Number 03-2769.

Respectfully submitted

Mark E. Scott

PTO Reg. No. 43,100

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

P. O. Box 3267

Houston, TX 77253-3267

(713) 238-8000 (Phone)

(713) 238-8008 (Fax)

# This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:
☐ BLACK BORDERS
☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS .
LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY

## IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.